

have less than 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1455

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 212, I was attending the burial of a leading veteran from my district at Arlington National Cemetery. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION
OF H.R. 2185, UNEMPLOYMENT
COMPENSATION AMENDMENTS
OF 2003

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 248 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 248

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 2185) to extend the Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 2002. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the bill equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 248 is a closed rule, providing for the consideration of H.R. 2185, an extension of the Federal Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Program. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate, evenly divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The rule also provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions. This is a fair rule and one that will expedite the debate of this important extension so that we can provide needed economic security to the unemployed.

H.R. 2185 will provide for a 13-week extension of benefits for the unemployed. This legislation once again pro-

vides a total of 26 weeks of benefits to those in designated "high unemployment" States.

The extension of benefits under the Federal Temporary Extended Unemployment Compensation Program is set to have expired at the end of this month. I am pleased to bring this rule to the floor as this House responds to those who are without work. With passage of this bill, we ensure there is no break in essential benefits to families across the country.

H.R. 2185 provides over \$7 billion in extended Federal unemployment benefits in addition to the \$16 billion that this Congress has previously approved for both State and Federal unemployment. With the original legislation in March of 2002 and the first extension in January of this year, Congress has succeeded in assuring those families in need will have the funds precisely to put food on the table and pay for child care so that they can focus on becoming employed once again. In fact, this extension will help 2.5 million people in addition to the 5 million that have been helped through previous extensions.

I would like to highlight the previous work by this body to not only provide Federal unemployment benefits but also \$8 billion to the individual States for use in their individual unemployment programs.

□ 1500

I would like to thank the gentleman from California (Chairman THOMAS) for his leadership and the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DUNN) for sponsoring this important legislation. H.R. 2185 is important legislation, important to the continued economic health of families in all of the 50 States.

Mr. Speaker, hopefully this should be a bipartisan effort to provide benefits to the unemployed, and this rule allows this Chamber to consider it and consider it today. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support both the rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule. Once again, the Republican leadership is turning its back on working Americans. Last night, President Bush told over 7,500 wealthy Republican donors that this is a strong and compassionate country.

Mr. Speaker, this economy is anything but strong, and this leadership is anything but compassionate. I am sure the people in that crowd, the crowd that raised \$22 million for the Republican Party, cheered and clapped their hands every time somebody mentioned the Republican tax bill, or, as some have called it, the "No Millionaire Left Behind Bill." But what about the rest of the country? What about the people struggling to find work? They do not have as much to cheer about.

Let us look at the facts: over 2.7 million jobs have been lost since President Bush took office in 2001; long-term unemployment is at a 30-year high; the average length of unemployment is the highest since 1984; the economy has lost 500,000 jobs in the last 3 months; there are currently three unemployed workers competing for every available job.

Mr. Speaker, people are out of work, and they need help. The Republican leadership's solution is to be dragged, kicking and screaming, into doing the absolute minimum. Their proposal will continue to leave over 1 million unemployed workers in the cold.

We have seen this rerun before. The Republican leadership voluntarily let unemployment insurance expire last December, forcing millions of Americans to worry about how they would provide for their families during and after the holidays. Two weeks later they proposed a plan that denied 1 million people unemployment insurance.

That is compassionate? These unemployed Americans are not deadbeats. They are our neighbors, friends, and relatives. They do not want a handout, they want a job, but they need help while they search for a job.

It is well established that unemployment insurance provides a better stimulus than dividend tax cuts. In fact, we will see a \$1.73 return for every dollar invested in unemployed Americans. As an investment tool, expanding unemployment insurance is good policy, but it is also the morally right thing to do. Unemployment insurance is a safety net for American workers who lose their jobs through no fault of their own, and we have a moral responsibility to not let these workers down.

Now, before this current economic crisis, no Congress had ever extended unemployment insurance without including workers who already exhausted their Federal unemployment. But for the second time this year, the Republican leadership lets these workers down by cutting out the unemployed who have already exhausted their coverage.

This leadership should be ashamed of themselves for this disingenuous and insufficient bill. But they are not.

The unemployed deserve better until the job market improves, and the ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means has a bill to do just that. His bill would provide unemployment insurance for workers who are currently unemployed and are exhausting their coverage, and I support that plan.

But the Republican leadership has once again tossed aside the democratic process by denying the House the right to debate and vote on the proposed substitute offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL). At the end of this debate, I will move the previous question; and if defeated, I will offer an amendment to make the Rangel substitute in order.

The only reason I can think of to deny the Rangel substitute is that the

Republican leadership is terrified that it might actually pass. It is the same reason we were not allowed to vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COOPER) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) on worker rights at the Pentagon.

Instead of fostering the free and open debate that the American people deserve on these issues, we are once again forced into this unfair, closed procedure. In the long run the democratic process will suffer, but today it is the unemployed workers of America who are hurt by the actions of this leadership.

I urge my colleagues to join me in defeating the previous question, and, if that effort fails, voting "no" on the rule.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to reiterate and make clear that the legislation before us that we are bringing to the floor with this rule will provide for a 13-week extension of unemployment benefits in the Nation, and the legislation once again provides a total of 26 weeks of benefits to those in designated high-unemployment States.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I remind the gentleman that his proposal still leaves 1 million American workers out in the cold.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2¼ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, sometimes when a President flies somewhere, part of his trip is charged to his party's political committee because the trip is partly governmental and partly political.

The expenses for running the House for the next hour ought to be charged to the Republican Congressional Campaign Committee, because the purpose of this rule and of other rules we have seen so far is incumbent protection for the Republican Party.

What they have done is to shut down democracy within the House. It is democratic in the sense that you get elected to get here, but then it becomes authoritarian. There will be no free speech, there will be no chance to consider tough issues. Why? Not simply because we do not have enough time. We do not work very much around here. We do this to protect Republican incumbents from having to vote on difficult issues.

The purpose of the Committee on Rules is to make sure that Republicans can follow an extremely conservative leadership and do things that would be unpopular and then pretend that they had no choice. How does that happen? They vote for rules which prevent them from voting on these issues. They then go in a great act of fakery to their constituents and say, Gee, I would have

been with you, but I did not get a chance to vote on that issue, having themselves voted on the procedure which kept the issue off the floor. We cannot vote on important issues in the defense bill; we cannot vote on an alternative unemployment compensation.

It is a conscious and deliberate pattern, and it is particularly to accommodate that extraordinary breed known as the "moderate Republican." They specialize in razzle-dazzle. They specialize in being loyal executors of extreme right-wing policies, but in a way that allows them to go home and disclaim any responsibility for what they were doing. It would not be plausible to claim they were drunk for an entire session. That is usually the way people explain that sort of thing.

So what they do is to vote for rules, procedures that keep controversial issues off the floor, so they can then go and mislead their constituents by saying that they would have supported their position, but they did not have a chance to do it.

It is a self-inflicted constraint. It is the reverse Houdini. Houdini used to have people tie him in knots, and he would go before the people and untie the knots. What moderate Republicans do is the reverse Houdini. The moderate Republicans tie themselves in knots, and then they go before the voters and say, Gee, I'm sorry I couldn't help you, but I was all tied up in knots.

Let us vote against this rule and put an end to the most fundamental, political and intellectual dishonesty.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is wonderful to see the imagination on the other side of the aisle. In case somebody is watching this debate or listening to it, I would like to get us back to what we are debating.

H.R. 2185 will provide for a 13-week extension of benefits for the unemployed in the United States, and the legislation once again provides a total of 26 weeks of benefits to those in designated high-unemployment States.

I recall the debate we had last week when the "theme du jour" was that these unemployment benefits were going to expire before the end of May. Well, we are acting today so that they will not expire, and there will be another 13 weeks of benefits, plus 26 weeks in the high-unemployment States that are designated as such.

So that is what is before us today. It is an important piece of legislation. That is why I will continue to urge my colleagues to support both the rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserving the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, again I remind those watching that under their bill, 1 million American workers will be left in the cold with no benefits.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY).

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, this is quite a day in the life of Congress. We are going to pass a \$350 billion tax cut, 75 percent of which goes to the wealthiest 5 percent of the households in this country. We are going to authorize the Federal Government to borrow almost an additional \$1 trillion. The day of the big tax cut is the day we vote the largest extension of borrowing authority to this country, in light of the red ink we will run, ever enacted.

So, in the middle of all of this, it appeared certain that nothing would be done to address the fate of our unemployed workers. Only in the last few hours has this plan emerged; and we are glad it has, as far as it goes. Certainly something needed to be done, because the economic performance of the country has been abysmal: 2.7 million private sector jobs lost over the last 2 years, an extraordinary decrease; 3.4 unemployed workers for every single job opening.

Now, under this circumstance, people try to find work, but they cannot find work, so their unemployment benefits run out.

I am going to ask for a "no" vote on this rule, however, because the proposal brought before us has a fatal flaw. It only extends benefits if your benefits have not lapsed. If you were unfortunate enough to lose your job, been on the job market, pounding the shoe leather, sending out resumes, looking everywhere for employment, but have not found employment before your unemployment benefits lapsed, guess what? You will not get any extension, you will not get any relief, under the measure brought before the House.

Now, we have an amendment to offer to cure this fatal flaw of the majority proposal so that people whose benefits have lapsed also get some help. Lord knows they need it. But we are not allowed to offer that amendment.

What could be more ridiculous? We will extend benefits if you have not lapsed yet; but if you have lapsed, you get no help whatsoever. Well, you think, that must have been inadvertent somehow. Let us fix that.

They will not let us fix that with an amendment. That is why the rule is unfair. That is why the response is inadequate. Vote "no" on the rule.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN).

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, last week Democrats tried to get a vote on extending unemployment benefits three times on the floor of this House. Each time the Republican majority said no. So we are happy that the Republican leadership has finally agreed to consider this very important issue. However, we are concerned that the bill being brought to the floor today will exclude more than 1 million unemployed workers.

The legislation filed with the Committee on Rules last night extends unemployment benefits only for those exhausting their regular unemployment compensation. It does nothing for those who have exhausted their Federal unemployment, 13 weeks.

This is certainly an important step in the right direction. However, the Republican bill does not provide any assistance for those workers who have already run out of their 13 weeks of extended benefits. More than 1 million Americans now fall into this category.

Given that we are in the longest period of negative job growth since the Great Depression, I cannot understand why we would want to deny unemployment benefits to Americans suffering from long-term unemployment.

As my friend from North Dakota pointed out, for every person who is unemployed, there are three people looking for a job, for every job available. These individuals are looking for jobs that simply cannot be found.

We recently had a report that came back that showed there are 70 percent more workers who have exhausted their Federal benefits during this recession than during the 1990s; yet in the 1990s we extended the number of weeks beyond what we are extending in this legislation.

Without unemployment compensation, how are these families going to pay their rent or mortgage? Last month, Mr. Speaker, one of these long-term unemployed workers came and testified before the Committee on Ways and Means. His name was Joe Bergmann. Over the last year and a half, Joe has sent out 2,000 resumes, searched 32 job sites on the Internet, and has taken extra training classes; but he still is unable to find a job. Joe has worked his entire adult life, but is now having a hard time in an economy that has lost 2.7 million jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject the previous question so that we can extend unemployment benefits for every worker that has lost their job during this very difficult economy. It is the right thing to do, to extend the benefits to all who need the help.

We have the money in the Federal unemployment trust funds; \$21 billion is in those funds. It will adequately cover not only the extension of the 13 weeks, but the extra benefits for those who have exhausted their Federal unemployment compensation benefits.

□ 1515

We have the money. By defeating the previous question, we can have the right legislative solution. We can do it before we adjourn.

I urge my colleagues to reject the previous question.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

(Mr. LEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, they say a half a loaf is better than none. This is

a half a loaf. It will help one million workers who have been left out or threatened to be left out in the cold. But there are actually more than one million people who have been out of work or will be out of work for longer than the 9 months who are going to be just given the cold shoulder by what the Republicans are doing here today.

They refuse to give us the chance to provide some benefits for those who have been looking for work but have been out of work for more than 9 months. It is ironic, those out of work the longest get the cold shoulder from the Republicans.

Mr. Speaker, it was just a few days ago that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) said, "I think it is a stretch to say that we are at a crisis point." So there was no action on unemployment comp. I guess Mr. Rove called up and said, politically, you had better cover your base. So here we are today. But covering a political base is not going to help close to two million people who have either exhausted their benefits or will soon do that altogether.

I was looking at the data, and it is really sad. They talk, the gentlemen from the Committee on Rules, about the States that have triggered in to extended benefits beyond the 39. That is only six States. The majority of workers in the majority of States are also left out in the cold.

By the way, it is not only their needs, it is the need of the country. When we provide unemployment comp benefits, we provide money into the economy to grow the GDP, because people who are unemployed tend to spend the money they receive through benefits.

So what are they afraid of? Why do they not let us bring before the floor the second half of that loaf? What are they afraid of? Answer that question. Why not give us a chance to bring it up? Why a rule that turns the cold shoulder in the end to two million Americans? I would be glad to have an answer.

Instead, the Republicans sit silently. They say there is no crisis and, at the last minute, act. I urge that we reject the rule.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

Mr. MCDERMOTT. A few minutes ago, Mr. Speaker, I came out and talked about this being a rubber stamp Congress. We now have a perfect example.

We brought up in the Committee on Ways and Means at least three or four times, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) did, the issue of unemployment. The chairman said, whoa, we cannot do anything about that. The person who sponsors the bill today voted no against it in the committee again and again and again.

Then we come out here on the floor and they say, oh, no, we cannot vote for unemployment.

Then they must have done a poll and the poll must have come back real bad, because we have a bill here that we are going to vote on what about 90 percent of the people in this House will have never even seen. They will not know what it says here. It was filed on May 21. Would that be yesterday?

This has not had any hearings, no testimony from anybody to come in and talk about this issue, and we run it out here and we put it under martial law and we run it through the House. If that is not a rubber stamp for the White House, I do not know what is.

They have Mr. Rove down there. He gins up all kinds of destruction in Colorado and Texas. He also runs what happens on this floor. The junta up in the leadership office, that junta says, Mr. THOMAS, you cannot handle this. We will send it straight to Rules. You are not smart enough to get a bill out or handle any kind of discussion about what is going on.

It is an absolute destruction of the process. They ought to allow us to have amendments to fix this. We heard from the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) that there are problems. There are one million people who are not covered by this.

Even Mr. Greenspan says that probably people who are not getting jobs now are not doing it because they like being on unemployment. They cannot find work. Why would we leave \$20 billion in the unemployment fund put there by these very people? Why would we not give it to them during this period? It is because the rubber stamp at the White House has come out, boom, this is what we are doing. And our leadership on the other side, they get all in line and say, folks, this is what we are doing.

Here, the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DUNN), put this bill in. They put it in last night. They have a Committee on Rules meeting at 11 o'clock after they have a \$22 million fundraiser. They all troop back in and say, great, now let us get things ready for tomorrow. This is what we get. Maybe we will be here tomorrow doing more rubber stamp stuff. We are going to do unemployment and this tax bill so they can go home and say they have handled unemployment.

I come from a State with the highest unemployment in the country. When that happened before, we had people who were defeated who voted against it, so they remembered. Now we must come with this bill, so rubber stamp it. "Get ready, guys. Bring your rubber stamps from the office when you come over."

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS).

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

I rise, Mr. Speaker, and I am also happy to see that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have finally agreed to consider an extension of unemployment compensation. It is about time.

But Mr. Speaker, it is only half a loaf. It is a bill that is much needed to help 2.7 million Americans that have lost their jobs, but it does not go far enough. I am again disappointed that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle refuse to allow us the opportunity to improve upon that bill.

I say that very genuinely because in my own State of California over 351,000 workers have lost their jobs since President Bush took office. I know this because in my own district I represent a portion of Los Angeles County, East Los Angeles. The cities of El Monte and Azusa have had upwards of 10 percent unemployment for over 2 years.

Where is the relief for our communities? Where is the relief for people wanting to earn good money and good-paying jobs? Even that tax cut that we are going to be voting on that some of them are supporting is not even going to provide any relief to those workers.

I ask Members to please allow our party, our side of the aisle, to amend the bill and promote goodwill for those millions of workers and the chronically underemployed Latinos, disadvantaged folks, that have been waiting for something to happen here in the House of Representatives. I am ashamed to go home and not provide relief for those more than one million workers and a large number that I represent in California.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

I do not doubt for a minute that the Republicans would have been perfectly happy, probably preferred, to go home for a week letting unemployment benefits expire; give tax cuts to the rich today, that is the number one priority, \$350 billion, most of which goes to the richest Americans, and zip to the unemployed. Actually, they did it at Christmastime, right before Christmas, let those benefits expire.

But after the Democrats pushed and pushed, and maybe there was some polling done, they decided to not only do something for the Bush class but to do something for the middle class and for the unemployed workers, \$5 billion compared to \$350 billion. Okay, we are grateful for that.

But over a \$100,000 tax cut to Secretary of the Treasury Snow and still zero dollars for the more than one million workers who are still out of work, 53,000 in Illinois. Some over on the other side of the aisle have fretted about, oh, unemployment benefits, they just encourage people to stay home and not look for a job. How dare they? These people want a job, and this administration and its economic plan has been nothing but a job-killer, a job-killer. We have seen the loss of over 2.5 million jobs since this President has come in. The economy is going down.

These people want to work. People in my own family who have been laid off,

they want nothing more than a good job. These people do not want unemployment insurance benefits. They want a job. But at the very least, we should be making sure that all those people who play by the rules, are looking for a job every day, get something.

On this floor of this House we should be able to debate alternatives. We are just cut off. Why? Because our alternative is better. It addresses the need for the American people, and that is exactly what the Republicans do not want to hear. They do not want to give anyone a chance to vote on our better plan. We should be voting no on the rule.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to my colleague and friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA).

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. I apologize for my voice, which I am unfortunately losing. But before I lose my voice, I think it is important that someone respond to the rhetoric we have heard from the other side of the aisle.

Once again, the other side of the aisle offers the American people their solution for the economy. That is unlimited unemployment benefits. I think Republicans are compassionate people, and we are taking care of those who have lost their jobs. The other side of the aisle, their solution has been increased taxation, increased regulation, increased litigation. Unfortunately, from the other side of the aisle, my friends and colleagues, they do not have a clue, a clue as to how we create jobs in business.

I have \$20 here. If I send this \$20 to Washington, I do not have \$20 to spend, I do not have \$20 to invest.

□ 1530

It takes capital. I do not think they have a clue as to basic free enterprise or business investment tenets. People have to have money in their pockets. They want to put more money in Washington. They want them to rely on the government for unemployment benefits. If you want to stimulate business, well, first of all, most of them should go out and try to start a business. When you have increased taxation and you send more money to Washington, you have fewer people to invest in that business. A basic tenet. When you send more money to Washington, you have less money to spend, and it hurts the poor the most because they have the least amount of money, and you cannot start a business. When you have increased regulation, which they have spent 30 and 40 years piling regulations on the business man and woman, it is impossible to start a business.

Would you start a business? I cannot tell you how happy I am to be out of a business because of government regulation, taxation, and then finally litigation, the protectors of litigation. So we become the most lawsuit-happy land in the world. And we drive businesses

overseas because of taxation, because of regulation, and because of litigation.

Would you want to get into business in the United States of America today with the opportunity to be sued at every corner? Small business people, the largest employer in this country, by far the largest employer, they are backing off of providing health insurance benefits. We have more people without health insurance benefits. Why? Because the other side blocks litigation reform and they have gone crazy with lawsuits. And a few people are benefiting and the rest of us are paying. People who can least afford it are not having health care coverage; small business operators are unable to provide health care coverage.

So that is their plan, increased taxation, increased litigation, increased government regulation. And then finally, here they offer their grand plan, unlimited unemployment extension. No one has come up to me and said, I want unlimited unemployment benefits from the Federal Government. I want a job. I want an opportunity to share in the American Dream. I want health care coverage. I do not want more suits, more money to go to Washington, less control of my life, less control of my money.

I have heard it, and I think we have all heard it. The song and dance from the other side just does not work, will not work. Even the former Soviet Union tried a full government plan. It did not work. So now we have a choice. We will have a tax and economic package before us that puts more money in the hands of the American people. It gives them an opportunity. It gives people an opportunity for a job, not just for an extension of unemployment benefits.

The Republicans are compassionate. They have provided for both an extension of unemployment benefits but also for hope and opportunity and for an America we all want for the future.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would say to the gentleman that what we want is help for unemployed workers, and your plan leaves a million workers out in the cold, and that is not the least bit compassionate.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 seconds to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I just have to express my dismay at the anti-American diatribe we have just heard. I am sorry to hear this defeatist attitude about the American economy. The American economy continues to be a vibrant one overall, and to have it so thoroughly denigrated and to be told that no one ought to want to go into business in America is a shockingly anti-American approach.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, this rule should be rejected because the bill is unfair.

Under this bill, thousands of jobless Californians will get an additional 13 weeks of unemployment instead of the 26 weeks that other States will get because California is not considered a high-unemployment State.

Well, tell that to the people of Santa Clara County. An editorial in today's San Jose Mercury News lays out the facts. Since President Bush took office in January of 2001, 2.6 million jobs have vanished in America, 239,000 of them in Santa Clara County gone.

We have had a 42 percent decrease in venture capital. The unemployment rate in San Jose is now a whopping 8.5 percent, and San Jose has lost nearly 16 percent of its jobs. Yet this bill does not treat Santa Clara County as a high-unemployment area, even though my county has more population than many States, including North and South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, Delaware and many others to name just a few.

This rule does not even let us debate whether a 26-week extension is appropriate, not just for the 6 States the Republicans consider to be high unemployment, but for cities like San Jose who are well above the national unemployment rate. I hear and get e-mails from people all the time, qualified, educated people who have been laid off, who send out thousands of resumes and cannot even get an interview, people who have run through their savings, who have refinanced their house, and who have run through that, whose unemployment is running off and the layoffs are continuing.

My friends on the other side of the aisle do not get it. It is not a recession in Silicon Valley right now. It is a depression. A 26-week extension is justified, and I wish we had a chance to debate that. I urge my colleagues to reject this rule so that we will.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the chairman of the Committee on Rules.

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this rule.

I will admit that my number one economic priority is not the extension of unemployment benefits. My number one economic priority is to create jobs and to put into place the kinds of mechanisms that we can to encourage job creation and economic growth.

My very good friend from Santa Clara County who just talked about what she described as a depression in the Silicon Valley and I will be offering an amendment later this afternoon which will, I believe, play a role in creating the kind of jobs in the Silicon Valley which are so important to improving the quality of life not only for people in that part of our country, but throughout the rest of the Nation.

I also believe that as we look at the jobs and economic growth package

which we are going to be considering, it is geared towards job creation and economic growth. Now, having said that, I will acknowledge Chairman Greenspan is absolutely right when he says that there are a lot of people out there who through no fault of their own have been victimized by this downturn which, by the way, began during the last two quarters of 2000.

Now my friend, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), just described the job loss since President Bush took office; but virtually every economist has acknowledged that the downturn began during the last two quarters. We also know, and I do not need to remind my colleagues again, that we have suffered greatly over the past couple of years through the tragedy of September 11, and we are just emerging from a war with Iraq, and we are still in the midst of this very costly war on terrorism.

We are working together in a bipartisan way to deal with these issues; but quite frankly, they have played a role in creating the economic downturn. And that is why we as Republicans are proud to step up to the plate and deal with the extension of unemployment benefits.

I know that there are parts of States as have been described by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) that are suffering more than other parts of States and the overall level is not as high as it is in other States that will, in fact, end up receiving a 26-week extension. But I believe that our dealing with this question before we get to the expiration is the right thing for us to do. Let us move ahead. This will be a problem that we will continue to address as we face it. But I hope and pray that passage of the Dreier-Lofgren amendment this afternoon, that passage of the jobs and growth package that we have will deal with the challenges that we have. And so I encourage my colleagues to provide support for this measure.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just respond that under this limited bill over 150,000 workers in California will be left out in the cold and close to 60,000 workers in Florida will not get their benefits.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL).

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this rule.

The underlying bill does very little for those working Americans whose benefits have run out. In my home town of Chicago unemployment is up to 6.7 percent. My State of Illinois has lost 17,400 jobs in the last month alone. We have lost in this economy 2.75 million jobs, 2 million manufacturing jobs. Two weeks from today, on June 6, the new unemployment figures will come out; and we will get close to, as indications are now, losing 3 million jobs. Since the first economic package that the President has passed, 2.5 million

Americans have lost their jobs, 5 million Americans have lost their health care. Nearly a trillion dollars' worth of corporate assets have been foreclosed on, and 2 million Americans have gone out of the middle class to poverty.

That has been the net result of the economic program put together. And as Ronald Reagan used to say, "Facts are a stubborn thing."

USA Today reported just the other day that they have the lowest amount of job-wanted ads since 1964. The only two things that seem to be growing in the President's growth package is the deficit and unemployment.

We have gone from a surplus to a slump. Now to the earlier speaker who took a \$20 bill out of his pocket and my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MIKA), that \$20 is the same amount of money our government and our taxpayers are paying individual workers in Iraq and Iraqis. That is what we are paying them. We are offering them \$20 as a form of employment to get the economy in Iraq moving. We have an agenda for Iraq. It is investing in 20,000 schools, 25,000 units of housing, text books for schools, 4 million children get early childhood education in Iraq.

We have an economic plan for Iraq, and we have an economic plan for America; and it does not just count on stimulating only the stock market. We have to stimulate the job market as well as the stock market. And our economic plan does exactly that. It does not force Americans into an either/or choice. And there will be people who will be left out, unlike the tax cut that leaves no millionaire behind.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), our ranking member on the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate our friends on the Republican side of the aisle. This day perfectly summarizes what Republican Party values are all about.

Under President Bush we have lost well more than 2 million jobs in this economy, and today we have the Republican answer. Their answer is to leave behind one million working Americans who have been out of work and cannot find work and are now no longer even eligible to receive unemployment. At the same time they are going to pass a tax bill in the dead of night which gives a huge share of the benefits in that bill to people who make over \$300,000 a year. That warped and misguided and misbegotten sense of values is the major reason that I left the Republican Party a long time ago and joined the Democratic Party.

The Republican Party practices the tired old game of trickle down economics. They practice the idea that if you just give John D. Rockefeller a tax break, eventually some of it will trickle down to Jay Rockefeller. Well, that is not good enough.

My old friend Harvey Dueholm from Wisconsin used to say, "The problem with Republican economics is that they want to give the poor and the rich the same amount of ice but they give the poor theirs in the winter time."

That pretty much sums up what is happening today. We have seen a miserably mismanaged economy under this administration. We have seen this Congress swallow whole budget proposals that walk away from our commitments to education, walk away from our obligation to do something about the health care problems in this country, walk away from the problems of the people who have lost their jobs and are down on their luck and have nowhere to turn. And yet, oh, they have plenty of money for the top dogs in this society.

Just once be for the average dog; be for the under dog. I know that is too much to expect, but nonetheless I would like to see it.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, simply to reiterate what we are about today, we are extending unemployment benefits for 13 weeks throughout the Nation and for 26 weeks in the States that are classified as high-unemployment States. We have also provided previously \$8 billion to the individual States for use in their individual unemployment programs, and almost \$6 billion of those \$8 billion that the Federal Government has provided to the States are still available to the States for use for their unemployment programs.

It is important to realize what we are talking about today with this legislation; this is not theory. We have legislation before us, we are bringing to the floor legislation to help 2.5 million unemployed people in this country. And we think that is an important piece of legislation, and we think that it should be passed. And that is why we seek to bring it forward with this rule. And that is why we urge support for this rule and then for the subsequent underlying legislation, to get that aid, that continued aid to 2.5 million people in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Massachusetts has 2¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire if the gentleman has any further speakers, because I am the final speaker on my side.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I will close.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I will be calling for a vote on the previous question. And if the previous question is defeated, I will offer an amendment to the rule. My amendment will make in order the Rangel substitute amendment which is

identical to the text of H.R. 1652, the Unemployment Benefits Extension Act.

H.R. 1652 will extend Federal unemployment benefits by 26 weeks and will also give an additional 13 weeks to those unemployed workers whose benefits have been exhausted. The Republican bill only extends benefits by 13 weeks and does nothing for workers whose benefits have run out.

Mr. Speaker, unemployment rates continue to rise. They increased to 6 percent in April, the third month in a row that the economy has lost jobs. For every one available job, there are three Americans looking for work.

Out-of-work Americans need relief, and they need it immediately. Current Federal unemployment benefits run out at the end of this month, less than 2 weeks away. Without an extension, 2.1 million Americans will lose their unemployment benefits. Since the current recession began in 2001, 2.7 million jobs have disappeared in this country. In the last 3 months alone over half a million private sector jobs have vanished. The number of unemployed people is at the highest point in a decade; and, sadly, there is no indication that the economic situation in our Nation will provide relief anytime soon.

□ 1545

Republicans in the House have voted against extending these critical benefits four times in the last 2 weeks, and I am glad they are finally bringing up this legislation today. But I am very disappointed that they will not let the House vote on the Rangel substitute, which will bring relief to far more people in need.

Under the Republican bill, 1 million people will be left behind, and that is unconscionable. Why will they not let us bring the Rangel substitute up? What are they afraid of? We are just about to pass a massive tax bill later today. If we took a tiny percentage of the money from that bill, we could help millions of unemployed American workers go through this very difficult time. But, no, we are going to instead give massive tax cuts to the very richest in this country.

Let me make very clear that a "no" vote on the previous question will not stop the consideration of the legislation to extend Federal unemployment benefits, but a "no" vote will allow this House to vote on the Rangel substitute, which will provide more benefits to more unemployed Americans. However, a "yes" vote on the previous question will prevent the House voting on a more generous and more far-reaching extension of Federal unemployment benefits to our unemployed workers. I would urge a "no" vote on the previous question.

This is an important issue. We should have an open debate. We should be able to consider and vote up or down on the Rangel substitute. The fact that we are being denied that opportunity is wrong, it is unconscionable, and I would urge my colleagues again to vote "no" on the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the amendment and a description of the amendment be printed in the RECORD immediately before the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, today we are extending the unemployment benefits for 2½ million Americans, and in doing so this Congress is appropriating \$7 billion for that purpose. Again, it is 2½ million Americans who are unemployed that this legislation will help. That is in addition to the \$16 billion that we have appropriated before for that purpose.

This is important legislation. It is to help people who need help, and I feel proud to have brought forward this rule. I urge support for the rule and that then we get to the underlying legislation and that we pass the underlying legislation to get extended unemployment benefits to 2½ million people in this country.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

PREVIOUS QUESTION FOR H. RES. 248—RULE ON H.R. 2185 UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION AMENDMENTS OF 2003

In the resolution strike "and (2)" and insert the following:

"(2) an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of H.R. 1652 if offered by Representative Rangel or a designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, and shall separately be debatable for 60 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3)"

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting, if ordered, on the question of agreeing to the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 217, nays 203, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 213]

YEAS—217

Aderholt	Gerlach	Ose
Akin	Gibbons	Otter
Bachus	Gilchrest	Paul
Baker	Gillmor	Pearce
Ballenger	Goode	Pence
Barrett (SC)	Goodlatte	Peterson (PA)
Bartlett (MD)	Goss	Petri
Barton (TX)	Granger	Pickering
Bass	Graves	Pitts
Beauprez	Green (WI)	Platts
Biggett	Greenwood	Pombo
Bilirakis	Gutknecht	Porter
Bishop (UT)	Harris	Portman
Blackburn	Hart	Pryce (OH)
Blunt	Hastings (WA)	Putnam
Boehrlert	Hayes	Radanovich
Boehner	Hayworth	Ramstad
Bonner	Hefley	Regula
Bono	Hensarling	Rehberg
Boozman	Herger	Renzi
Bradley (NH)	Hobson	Reynolds
Brady (TX)	Hoekstra	Rogers (AL)
Brown (SC)	Hostettler	Rogers (KY)
Brown-Waite,	Houghton	Rogers (MI)
Ginny	Hulshof	Rohrabacher
Burgess	Hyde	Ros-Lehtinen
Burns	Isakson	Royce
Burr	Istook	Ryan (WI)
Burton (IN)	Janklow	Ryun (KS)
Buyer	Jenkins	Saxton
Calvert	Johnson (CT)	Schrock
Camp	Johnson (IL)	Sensenbrenner
Cannon	Johnson, Sam	Sessions
Cantor	Jones (NC)	Shadegg
Capito	Keller	Shaw
Carter	Kelly	Shays
Castle	Kennedy (MN)	Sherwood
Chabot	King (IA)	Shimkus
Chocola	King (NY)	Shuster
Coble	Kingston	Simmons
Cole	Kirk	Simpson
Collins	Kline	Smith (MI)
Cox	Knollenberg	Smith (NJ)
Crane	Kolbe	Smith (TX)
Crenshaw	LaHood	Souder
Cubin	Latham	Stearns
Culberson	LaTourette	Sullivan
Davis, Jo Ann	Leach	Sweeney
Davis, Tom	Lewis (CA)	Tancred
Deal (GA)	Lewis (KY)	Taylor (NC)
DeLay	Linder	Terry
DeMint	LoBiondo	Thomas
Diaz-Balart, L.	Lucas (OK)	Thornberry
Diaz-Balart, M.	Manzullo	Tiahrt
Doolittle	McCotter	Tiberi
Dreier	McCrery	Toomey
Duncan	McHugh	Turner (OH)
Dunn	McInnis	Upton
Ehlers	McKeon	Vitter
Emerson	Mica	Walden (OR)
English	Miller (FL)	Walsh
Everett	Miller (MI)	Wamp
Feeney	Miller, Gary	Weldon (FL)
Flake	Moran (KS)	Weldon (PA)
Fletcher	Murphy	Weller
Foley	Musgrave	Whitfield
Forbes	Myrick	Wicker
Fossella	Nethercutt	Wilson (NM)
Franks (AZ)	Ney	Wilson (SC)
Frelinghuysen	Northup	Wolf
Gallegly	Nunes	Young (AK)
Garrett (NJ)	Nussle	Young (FL)
	Osborne	

NAYS—203

Abercrombie	Brady (PA)	Davis (TN)
Ackerman	Brown (OH)	DeFazio
Alexander	Brown, Corrine	DeGette
Allen	Capps	Delahunt
Andrews	Capuano	DeLauro
Baca	Cardin	Deutsch
Baird	Cardoza	Dicks
Baldwin	Carson (IN)	Dingell
Ballance	Carson (OK)	Doggett
Becerra	Case	Dooley (CA)
Bell	Clay	Doyle
Bereuter	Clyburn	Edwards
Berkley	Cooper	Emanuel
Berman	Costello	Engel
Berry	Cramer	Eshoo
Bishop (GA)	Crowley	Etheridge
Bishop (NY)	Cummings	Evans
Blumenauer	Davis (AL)	Farr
Boswell	Davis (CA)	Fattah
Boucher	Davis (FL)	Filner
Boyd	Davis (IL)	Ford

Frank (MA)	Majette	Ruppersberger
Frost	Maloney	Rush
Gonzalez	Markey	Ryan (OH)
Gordon	Marshall	Sabo
Green (TX)	Matheson	Sanchez, Linda
Grijalva	Matsui	T.
Gutierrez	McCarthy (MO)	Sanchez, Loretta
Hall	McCarthy (NY)	Sanders
Harman	McCollum	Sandlin
Hastings (FL)	McDermott	Schakowsky
Hill	McGovern	Schiff
Hinchey	McIntyre	Scott (GA)
Hinojosa	McNulty	Scott (VA)
Hoefel	Meehan	Serrano
Holden	Meek (FL)	Sherman
Holt	Meeks (NY)	Skelton
Honda	Menendez	Slaughter
Hoolley (OR)	Michaud	Smith (WA)
Hoyer	Millender-	Snyder
Inslee	McDonald	Solis
Israel	Miller (NC)	Spratt
Jackson (IL)	Miller, George	Stark
Jackson-Lee	Mollohan	Stenholm
(TX)	Moore	Strickland
Jefferson	Moran (VA)	Stupak
John	Murtha	Tanner
Johnson, E. B.	Nadler	Tauscher
Jones (OH)	Neal (MA)	Taylor (MS)
Kanjorski	Oberstar	Thompson (CA)
Kaptur	Obey	Thompson (MS)
Kennedy (RI)	Olver	Tierney
Kildee	Ortiz	Towns
Kilpatrick	Owens	Turner (TX)
Kind	Pallone	Udall (CO)
Klecza	Pascrell	Udall (NM)
Kucinich	Pastor	Van Hollen
Lampson	Payne	Velazquez
Langevin	Pelosi	Visclosky
Lantos	Peterson (MN)	Waters
Larsen (WA)	Pomeroy	Watson
Larson (CT)	Price (NC)	Watt
Lee	Rahall	Waxman
Levin	Rangel	Weiner
Lipinski	Reyes	Wexler
Lofgren	Rodriguez	Woolsey
Lowe	Ross	Wu
Lucas (KY)	Rothman	Wynn
Lynch	Roybal-Allard	

NOT VOTING—14

Bonilla	Gingrey	Norwood
Combest	Hunter	Oxley
Conyers	Issa	Quinn
Cunningham	Lewis (GA)	Tauzin
Gephardt	Napolitano	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) (during the vote). Members are advised that 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1606

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 216, noes 201, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 214]

AYES—216

Aderholt	Biggett	Boozman
Akin	Bilirakis	Bradley (NH)
Bachus	Bishop (UT)	Brady (TX)
Baker	Blackburn	Brown (SC)
Ballenger	Blunt	Brown-Waite,
Barrett (SC)	Boehrlert	Ginny
Bartlett (MD)	Boehner	Burgess
Bass	Bonner	Burns
Beauprez	Bono	Burr

Burton (IN)	Hensarling	Pitts
Buyer	Herger	Platts
Calvert	Hobson	Pombo
Camp	Hoekstra	Porter
Cannon	Hostettler	Pryce (OH)
Cantor	Houghton	Putnam
Capito	Hulshof	Radanovich
Carter	Hyde	Ramstad
Castle	Isakson	Regula
Chabot	Istook	Rehberg
Chocola	Janklow	Renzi
Coble	Jenkins	Reynolds
Cole	Johnson (CT)	Rogers (AL)
Collins	Johnson (IL)	Rogers (KY)
Cox	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (MI)
Crane	Jones (NC)	Rohrabacher
Crenshaw	Keller	Ros-Lehtinen
Cubin	Kelly	Royce
Culberson	Kennedy (MN)	Ryan (WI)
Davis, Jo Ann	King (IA)	Ryun (KS)
Davis, Tom	King (NY)	Saxton
Deal (GA)	Kingston	Schrock
DeLay	Kirk	Sensenbrenner
DeMint	Kline	Sessions
Diaz-Balart, L.	Knollenberg	Shadegg
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kolbe	Shaw
Doolittle	LaHood	Shays
Dreier	Latham	Sherwood
Duncan	LaTourette	Shimkus
Dunn	Leach	Shuster
Ehlers	Lewis (CA)	Simmons
Emerson	Lewis (KY)	Simpson
English	Linder	Smith (MI)
Everett	LoBiondo	Smith (NJ)
Feeney	Lucas (OK)	Smith (TX)
Ferguson	Manzullo	Souder
Flake	McCotter	Stearns
Fletcher	McCrery	Sullivan
Foley	McHugh	Sweeney
Forbes	McInnis	Tancred
Fossella	McKeon	Tauzin
Franks (AZ)	Mica	Taylor (NC)
Frelinghuysen	Miller (FL)	Terry
Gallegly	Miller (MI)	Thomas
Garrett (NJ)	Miller, Gary	Thornberry
	Moran (KS)	Tiahrt
	Murphy	Tiberi
	Gillmor	Toomey
	Gingrey	Turner (OH)
	Goode	Upton
	Nethercutt	Vitter
	Goodlatte	Walsh
	Goss	Wamp
	Granger	Weldon (FL)
	Graves	Weldon (PA)
	Green (WI)	Ose
	Greenwood	Otter
	Gutknecht	Paul
	Harris	Pearce
	Hart	Pence
	Hastings (WA)	Peterson (PA)
	Hayes	Petri
	Hayworth	Pickering
	Hefley	

NOES—201

Abercrombie	Costello	Green (TX)
Ackerman	Cramer	Grijalva
Alexander	Crowley	Gutierrez
Allen	Cummings	Harman
Andrews	Davis (AL)	Hastings (FL)
Baca	Davis (CA)	Hill
Baird	Davis (FL)	Hinchey
Baldwin	Davis (IL)	Hinojosa
Ballance	Davis (TN)	Hoefel
Becerra	DeFazio	Holden
Bell	DeGette	Holt
Berkley	Delahunt	Honda
Berman	DeLauro	Hoolley (OR)
Berry	Deutsch	Hoyer
Bishop (GA)	Dicks	Inslee
Bishop (NY)	Dingell	Israel
Blumenauer	Doggett	Jackson (IL)
Boswell	Dooley (CA)	Jackson-Lee
Boucher	Doyle	(TX)
Boyd	Edwards	Jefferson
Brady (PA)	Emanuel	John
Brown (OH)	Engel	Johnson, E. B.
Brown, Corrine	Eshoo	Jones (OH)
Capps	Etheridge	Kanjorski
Capuano	Evans	Kaptur
Cardin	Farr	Kennedy (RI)
Cardoza	Fattah	Kildee
Carson (IN)	Filner	Kilpatrick
Carson (OK)	Ford	Kind
Case	Frank (MA)	Klecza
Clay	Frost	Kucinich
Clyburn	Gonzalez	Lampson
Cooper	Gordon	Langevin

Lantos	Nadler	Scott (VA)
Larsen (WA)	Napolitano	Serrano
Larson (CT)	Neal (MA)	Sherman
Lee	Oberstar	Skelton
Levin	Obey	Slaughter
Lipinski	Olver	Smith (WA)
Lofgren	Ortiz	Snyder
Lowe	Owens	Solis
Lucas (KY)	Pallone	Spratt
Majette	Pascrell	Stark
Maloney	Pastor	Stenholm
Markey	Payne	Strickland
Marshall	Pelosi	Stupak
Matheson	Peterson (MN)	Tanner
Matsui	Pomeroy	Tauscher
McCarthy (MO)	Price (NC)	Taylor (MS)
McCarthy (NY)	Rahall	Thompson (CA)
McCollum	Rangel	Thompson (MS)
McDermott	Reyes	Tierney
McGovern	Rodriguez	Towns
McIntyre	Ross	Turner (TX)
McNulty	Rothman	Udall (CO)
Meehan	Roybal-Allard	Udall (NM)
Meek (FL)	Ruppersberger	Van Hollen
Meeks (NY)	Rush	Velazquez
Menendez	Ryan (OH)	Visclosky
Michaud	Sabo	Waters
Millender-	Sanchez, Linda	Watson
McDonald	T.	Watt
Miller (NC)	Sanchez, Loretta	Waxman
Miller, George	Sanders	Weiner
Mollohan	Sandlin	Wexler
Moore	Schakowsky	Woolsey
Moran (VA)	Schiff	Wu
Murtha	Scott (GA)	Wynn

NOT VOTING—17

Barton (TX)	Gephardt	Oxley
Bereuter	Hall	Portman
Bonilla	Issa	Quinn
Combust	Lewis (GA)	Walden (OR)
Conyers	Lynch	Wilson (SC)
Cunningham	Norwood	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1613

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2004

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Pursuant to House Resolution 247 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1588.

□ 1614

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1588) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2004 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2004, and for other purposes, with Mr. LAHOOD (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

□ 1615

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, May 21, 2003, amendment No. 9 printed in House Report 108-120 offered by the gentleman

from California (Mr. HUNTER) had been disposed of.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order: amendment No. 3 offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ), amendment No. 4 offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER), amendment No. 6 offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), and amendment No. 8 offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON).

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. LORETTA SANCHEZ OF CALIFORNIA

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California:

At the end of title VII (page 196, after line 12), add the following new section:

SEC. 708. LIMITING RESTRICTION OF USE OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE MEDICAL FACILITIES TO PERFORM ABORTIONS TO FACILITIES IN THE UNITED STATES.

Section 1093(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting "in the United States" after "Defense".

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 201, noes 227, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 215]

AYES—201

Abercrombie	Capps	Dunn
Ackerman	Capuano	Edwards
Allen	Cardin	Emanuel
Andrews	Cardoza	Engel
Baca	Carson (IN)	Eshoo
Baird	Carson (OK)	Etheridge
Baldwin	Case	Evans
Ballance	Castle	Farr
Bass	Clay	Fattah
Becerra	Clyburn	Filner
Bell	Conyers	Foley
Bereuter	Cooper	Ford
Berkley	Cramer	Frank (MA)
Berman	Crowley	Frelinghuysen
Biggert	Cummings	Frost
Bishop (GA)	Davis (AL)	Gilchrest
Bishop (NY)	Davis (CA)	Gonzalez
Blumenauer	Davis (FL)	Gordon
Boehlert	Davis (IL)	Green (TX)
Bono	DeFazio	Greenwood
Boswell	DeGette	Grijalva
Boucher	Delahunt	Gutierrez
Boyd	DeLauro	Harman
Bradley (NH)	Deutsch	Hastings (FL)
Brady (PA)	Dicks	Hill
Brown (OH)	Dingell	Hinchey
Brown, Corrine	Doggett	Hinojosa
Capito	Dooley (CA)	Hoeffel
		Holt
		Honda
		Hooley (OR)
		Houghton
		Hoyer
		Inslee
		Isakson
		Israel
		Jackson (IL)
		Jackson-Lee
		(TX)
		Jefferson
		Johnson (CT)
		Johnson, E. B.
		Jones (OH)
		Kaptur
		Kelly
		Kennedy (RI)
		Kilpatrick
		Kind
		Kirk
		Kleczka
		Kolbe
		Kucinich
		Lampson
		Lantos
		Larsen (WA)
		Larson (CT)
		Leach
		Lee
		Levin
		Lofgren
		Lowe
		Majette
		Maloney
		Markey
		Matheson
		Matsui
		McCarthy (MO)
		McCarthy (NY)
		McCollum
		McDermott
		McGovern
		Meehan
		Meek (FL)
		Meeks (NY)
		Menendez
		Millender-
		McDonald
		Miller (NC)
		Miller, George
		Mollohan
		Moore
		Moran (VA)
		Murtha
		Sanders
		Sandlin
		Schakowsky
		Schiff
		Scott (GA)
		Scott (VA)
		Serrano
		Shaw
		Shays
		Sherman
		Simmons
		Slaughter
		Smith (WA)
		Snyder
		Solis
		Spratt
		Stark
		Strickland
		Tanner
		Tauscher
		Thompson (CA)
		Thompson (MS)
		Tierney
		Towns
		Turner (TX)
		Udall (CO)
		Udall (NM)
		Van Hollen
		Velazquez
		Visclosky
		Walden (OR)
		Waters
		Watson
		Watt
		Waxman
		Weiner
		Wexler
		Woolsey
		Wu
		Wynn
		Emerson
		English
		Everett
		Feeney
		Ferguson
		Flake
		Fletcher
		Forbes
		Fossella
		Franks (AZ)
		Galleghy
		Garrett (NJ)
		Gerlach
		Gibbons
		Gillmor
		Gingrey
		Goode
		Goodlatte
		Goss
		Granger
		Graves
		Green (WI)
		Gutknecht
		Hall
		Harris
		Hart
		Hastert
		Hastings (WA)
		Hayes
		Hayworth
		Hefley
		Hensarling
		Herger
		Hobson
		Hoekstra
		Holden
		Hostettler
		Hulshof
		Hunter
		Hyde
		Istook
		Janklow
		Jenkins
		John
		Johnson (IL)
		Johnson, Sam
		Jones (NC)
		Kanjorski
		Keller
		Kennedy (MN)
		Kildee
		King (IA)
		King (NY)
		Kingston
		Kline
		Knollenberg
		LaHood
		Langevin
		Latham
		LaTourette
		Lewis (CA)
		Lewis (KY)
		Linder
		Lipinski
		LoBiondo
		Lucas (KY)
		Lucas (OK)
		Lynch
		Manzullo
		Marshall
		McCotter
		McCrery
		McHugh
		McInnis
		McIntyre
		McKeon
		McNulty
		Mica
		Michaud
		Miller (FL)
		Miller (MI)
		Miller, Gary
		Mollohan
		Moran (KS)
		Murphy
		Murtha
		Musgrave
		Myrick
		Nethercutt
		Ney
		Northup
		Norwood
		Nunes
		Nussle
		Oberstar
		Ortiz
		Osborne
		Otter
		Paul
		Pearce
		Pence
		Peterson (MN)
		Peterson (PA)
		Petri
		Pickering
		Pitts
		Platts
		Pombo
		Porter
		Portman
		Putnam
		Radanovich
		Rahall
		Regula